DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 277 CS 208 309

AUTHOR Olasky, Marvin N.
TITLE The Aborted Debate within Public Relations: An Approach through Kuhn's Paradigm.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Codes of Ethics; *Models; Persuasive Discourse; *Public Opinion; *Public Relations; Self Evaluation (Groups); *Textbook Content; *Theories
IDENTIFIERS Kuhn (Thomas)

ABSTRACT

An explanation for the general disdain for the practice of public relations may lie in textbooks that attempt to communicate methodology, while insinuating philosophy. In 10 surveyed public relations textbooks, the authors have tried to explain the contempt for public relations, but their common failing has been to blame outside forces, contending that the problems of the trade are caused not by the nature of the profession, but rather by a few unfortunate practices. There was one promising moment during the late 1950s and early 1960s when basic questions about the purpose of public relations were being asked. But judging from articles appearing in "Public Relations Journal" during the past half dozen years, it appears this slightly open door to reevaluation has been slammed shut. To learn why this debate aborted 20 years ago, one needs to examine a major argument developed by Thomas Kuhn. His basic building block is the paradigm, a particular theory that dominates a scientific or occupational field. Within an established paradigm, practitioners can get on with their work without being forced to spend time defending the basic principles of the paradigm or the world view that is its base. No theory provides a perfect fit with the facts, but when practitioners begin to understand that the most pressing problems they face have no solution within the old paradigm, questioning of that paradigm begins. The debate aborted because practitioners had developed a comfortable paradigm that was unshaken by social suspicion and mistrust of large organizations apparent since the mid-1960s. A new debate about public relations' purpose is long overdue. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED244277

Qualitative Studies Division

THE ABORTED DEBATE WITHIN PUBLIC RELATIONS: AN APPROACH THROUGH KUHN'S PARADIGM

by Marvin N. Olasky

Department of Journalism
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Presented to the Qualitative Studies Division at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Annual Convention, Gainesville, Florida, August 5-8, 1984.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marvin N. Olasky
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 208 309

Public Relations Quarterly survey question addressed to public relations practitioners: "The word 'image'...does it leave you with a bad taste, or do you believe it is an accurate description of the end product of your efforts?" One answer: "Creating images causes no problem for me. The image of PR people does. It stinks."[1]

Public relations counselor J. Carroll Bateman: "All too frequently, we appear to suffer from the delusion that we can really play God with people. We would do much better to lay off this kind of nonsense..."[2]

Why are public relations practitioners generally depicted as low-life liars? Why is a comment such as this so common: "PR is dangerous. Publicists do not often lie, but telling half the truth is an integral part of their business, and stretching the truth is not uncommon."[3] Or this: "Public relations works behind the scenes; occasionally the hand of the PR man can be seen shifting some bulky fact out of sight, but usually the public relations practitioner stands at the other end of a long rope which winds around several pulleys before it reaches the object of his invisible tugging."[4] Why are practitioners regularly labeled "high-paid errand boys and buffers for management," "tools of the top brass," "hucksters," "parrots," "awed by the majesty of their organization charts," "desperate," "impotent, evasive, egomaniacal, and lying"?[5] (And those are just the comments from the fans of public relations.)

Some public relations practitioners have argued that the root cause of such complaints is jealousy, particularly that of lower-paid newspaper folk. There is undoubtedly some truth in that defense, yet contempt for public relations goes far beyond the ranks of potentially jealous journalists. Other practitioners have cited ignorance on the part of the public as to what public relations men and women actually do all day. There may be some truth in that claim too, yet while only the Supreme Court seems to operate with as much secrecy as some public relations departments, the former is generally revered, while the "pr man" is equated ethically with that lowly cousin of the chief justice, the local ambulance chaser.[6]

One good place to go for an explanation of why a trade is in trouble, conceivably, might be the textbooks which attempt to communicate methodology, while insinuating philosophy, to future generations. Ten public relations textbooks surveyed for this paper, to their credit, do not entirely avoid the question of public relations disgrace. Their authors have tried to come up with reasons to explain why the very words 'public relations' bring sneers and tears. Their common failing, though, is an embrace of what could be called "the doctrine of selective depravity," otherwise known as, "Don't blame us, it's them, the immoral outsiders, who cause trouble."[7]

The most widely used textbook, Cutlip and Center's Effective Public Relations, now in its fifth edition, notes in its first chapter that "The labeling of public relations effort as frivolous or shallow, or as the synonym for a false front, has a

long history."[8] Examples are provided: "An editor tells his readers, 'If you want to get plausible disguises for unworthy causes, hire a public relations expert.' A columnist speaks of the 'perversion of the language by public relations...an accepted form of lying to the public to manipulate it as the promoters wish.' A newspaper labels public relations 'a parasite on the press.'[9] But Cutlip and Center then provide 500 pages of "how-to" techniques; they return to the central problem only in the final chapter. There they conclude not that manipulation should stop, but that all practitioners should "face the fact that they are special pleaders."[10] The problems of the trade, they suggest, are caused not by the nature of such special pleading, but by some particularly unfortunate practices. For instance, public relations "was given a black eye in the mind of the public by Richard Nixon's preoccupation with his misshapen concept of the function... Nixon's typical response to each new revelation of wrongdoing in his administration was, "Let's PR it."[11]

Nine other textbooks analyzed all contend or imply that the problems of public relations are similarly at the periphery: that were it not for some corrupt practitioners, or for Richard NIxon, or for some who falsely use the title "public relations counsel," or for certain mildly troublesome practices, public relations would be clothed in such magnificent robes that even insouciant children would not be able to detect nakedness triumphant. There are complaints about those who "usurp the title" of public relations practitioner, such as the Chicago prostitute arrested for soliciting after she had passed out

business cards with her name, phone number, address, and the two words, "Public Relations." But there is avoidance of key trouble spots. For instance, Fraser Seitel, director of public affairs at Chase Manhattan Bank and author of The Practice of Public Relations, minimizes the problems at large institutions but complains that, "There is nothing to prevent someone with little or no formal training from 'hanging out a shingle' as a public relations specialist. Such frauds embarrass professionals in the field. Thankfully, these phonies are becoming harder and harder to find."[12] Public relations consultant Lawrence Nolte, in Fundamentals of Public Relations, notes that some "use the designation as a respectable cover for activities which are not public relations at all."[13] But blaming the periphery does not come to grips with the corruption that can be found at the center of the public relations trade. Nor does it explain why public relations has made so little progress over the past thirty years that the excuses given now are virtual repetitions of those made then.

By reading a fascinating monograph entitled Public Relations and American Democracy and written about American public relations by visiting British political scientist J.A.R. Pimlott in 1951, we can see that history does not repeat itself but excuses do. Practitioners then, according to Pimlott, said "that their indifferent reputation is due to the incompetence and dishonesty of a minority of their number-- to 'the lunatic fringe of the profession, the headline wheedlers, the something-for-nothing boys,' to 'the antics of the quacks and charlatans who

cling to the fringe of our profession,' to 'the snide, weasel-minded, smart, conscienceless lads.'"[14] Pimlott wrote that, "There is something in the argument. As an explanation of the persistently poor reputation of the group it is, however, neither probable nor in accordance with the facts. Other professions carry lunatic and even dishonorable fringes without suffering much loss of esteem; and the truth is that public distrust arises less from tyros and quacks on the fringe than from the more widely publicized activities of some of the leading figures."[15]

There was one promising moment during the late 1950's and early 1960's, though, when basic questions about public relations purpose were being asked. One leading public relations agency, Ruder and Finn, held seminars designed to examine "pr philosophy," and an interest in reassessment was revealed even in the pages of Public Relations Journal, the leading trade magazine of the field. For instance, public relations manager J. Carroll Bateman argued that basic goals of practitioners had to change if they were ever to win greater public acceptance. Bateman wrote that, "To ourselves and to others we have too long-- and perhaps wrongly-- held ourselves out as 'molders of public opinion,' or to put it more bluntly, as professional persuaders. Persuasion is a means rather than an end...The worst thing that can happen to us in public relations is to continue to be tagged as manipulators of people or of public opinion. As manipulators we shall not win friends, nor find a lasting place in society. Nor shall we even be comfortable with ourselves."[16]

Bateman raised other pertinent questions in a Public Relations Journal article the following year entitled, "A New Moral Dimension for Communication." He noted that, "Many of the messages that are written or spoken today have been so carefully phrased to achieve a certain effect upon the intended audience that they mean nothing at all; or they serve as veils to meaning and may really mean the opposite of what they appear to say."[17] He criticized the trade philosophy revealed in the popular credo, "Sell the sizzle, not the steak," by asking, "How long will it continue to work? Haven't we already perceived a deterioration of public confidence in communication that deals with sizzles instead of steaks? If those of us who are professionally engaged in the art of communication will not devise messages that inform and educate our audiences, are we not helping to degrade them?"[18]

As late as 1962, other Public Relations Journal writers were going back to basics also. For instance, W. Howard Chase argued in November of that year that the philosophy behind the popular trade term coined by Edward Bernays, the "engineering of consent," should be opposed because the terms "implies the use of all the mechanics of persuasion and communication to bend others, either with their will or against their will, to some prearranged conclusion... I can't help but think that carrying the 'engineering of consent' line to a logical conclusion is the pistol at the back of the neck, reminiscent of Nazi times and not unknown behind the Iron Curtain."[19] Chase also criticized another mainstream definition of public relations, "having your good deeds and performances publicly acknowledged," because "It sounds

Pharisaical, so similar to the Pharisee on the street corner 'thanking God that I am not as other men...'"[20]

While this debate was percolating, though, there was an uprising in the ranks. Mainstream practitioners complained that a time when public relations was getting bigger and perhaps badder, but certainly more powerful and profitable, was no time to get self-critical. For instance, publicity supervisor John L. Normoyle tried to cut off incipient introspection at the knees by writing in Public Relations Journal that "Public relations, after a long struggle for recognition, has reached that point in its development which calls for a pause to evaluate its accomplishments and chart a course for tne future. Unfortunately, it is also a time when unrealistic pipe-dreams can inhibit the objective reasoning necessary at this stage."[21] The bit of questioning that was going on was turned by Normoyle into an "orgy of self-examination" and "dreamy speculation."[22]

By 1963, crossness at attacks on crassness had become dominant in the Public Relations Journal. Copywriter Dennis Altman, for instance, urged public relations practitioners to dump any concern about "intangibles" and instead create a new, improved "image of smartness, Machiavellian smartness" which would get them "to the front of the bus...Of course, your lives may not be happier up front. We get more ulcers, and more insomnia up there. But at least, after riding in front for a while, if you decide you don't like it, you'll be able to afford to get off and take a cab."[23] The more discerning know that getting off is not that easy, not that easy at all. But the era

of debate was put to bed, finally, with a 1963 article on public relations goals by counselor Andrew Lazarus. Lazarus used a true point, the real grounding of public relations (like all business) in financial calculation, to deride thought about the ethical grounding which is at least as essential. The goal of practitioners should be simply "to make money-- for their management, their clients and themselves," he wrote: "This may be a reductio ad absurdum," but the absurd would pay off more than "defending our profession, contemplating our navels, and needlessly worrying about our status..."[24]

The debate in its major trade magazine, and to a large extent in the public relations trade as a whole, just died after that. There were still occasional articles of mild criticism, including one by Georgetown University public relations director Arthur Cuervo. He wrote in 1975 that the real problem of public relations is that "mainstream practitioners engage in the engineering of consent that helps to mold public opinion to the profitable interest of the client at the expense of the public good," and take pride in doing so. Cuervo described the tendency "to blame the quacks in the field" and to say, "throw the rascals out and all will be right with the world of public relations." He noted that such a convenient placing of blame did not get to the core of the problem, for "<u>At the top of the PR enemies list should be the practitioners themselves.</u>"[25] But Cuervo's article apparently provoked little redrawing of the enemies list; judging from <u>Public Relations Journal</u> articles of the past half dozen years, it appears that that the slightly open door to

reevaluation of a generation ago has been slammed shut.

Some new public relations textbooks, avoiding the basic philosophical questions and adopting a systems approach to an unsystematic trade, even rewrite history to make past public relations practice appear worse than it was, and make the present by comparison a great improvement. For instance, James E. Grunig and Todd Hunt, in their 1984 textbook Managing Public Relations, appear to believe that nineteenth century public relations was all "press agentry and publicity" with truth thrown out the window, while the cutting edge of current practice is the "two-way symmetric model" with honest dealing predominating.[26] It is not the leaders of public relations, but those who still advocate "the public-information model" who have a problem: "Practitioners of the public-information model could be professionals, but... they often feel like 'prostitutes,' who must sacrifice journalistic values and report only the positive things about the organizations that employ them."[27] One of the problems with such a statement is that the values in question are not just journalistic values; they are basic questions of truth and honesty which, when buried, tend to surprise the gravediggers by rising from the dead.

Why did the public relations debate abort some twenty years ago? We can begin to answer that question through a brief restatement and application of the major argument developed in Thomas Kuhn's seminal work, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Kuhn's book was a trumpet blast directed at

scholars who want so much to get on with the work of empirical investigation that they blithely accept faulty theoretical foundations. Although most applications of his theory have been in academic disciplines, Kuhn's work would appear to be applicable as well to a "practical" field such as public relations where the tendency to run toward clients, without first walking through presuppositions, is very strong.

Kuhn's basic building block is the paradigm, a particular theory which dominates a scientific or occupational field. Paradigms are "universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners."[28] A paradigm explains to practitioners which problems are important and indicates how they are to be solved. Knowledge within the paradigm grows because of what Kuhn calls "normal science," the incremental advances which are made possible when practitioners, confident in their methodology, see little need for additional theorizing or criticism and instead make small but significant contributions to the growth of knowledge within their profession.

The existence of a paradigm is extremely useful for a profession; all fields or endeavors need presuppositions and frameworks to organize data. "Normal science" does allow for significant linear progress or growth within a particular discipline. As Kuhn notes, within an established paradigm the practitioner can get on with his work without being forced to spend time defending the basic principles of the paradigm or the world view which is its base. An academic or occupational

community tends to be happiest when novelty is far from its mind and when work unencumbered by epistemological worry can proceed.

While something is gained through such organization, something also is lost: the normal scientist (or historian, or public relations practitioner) tends to screen out data which do not fit in the paradigm. He ignores such information, terms it peripheral, and points to the positive growth of the field. Problems, though, arise with the development of what Kuhn calls "anomalies," those results of normal practice which cannot be reconciled with the paradigm, even when efforts are made to adjust or stretch it slightly. "There are always some discrepancies" between theory and practice, Kuhn notes, and effective practice can continue despite "persistent and recognized anomaly," but particular anomalies may "call into question explicit and fundamental generalizations of the paradigm."[29] Anomalies may reach the stage of "crisis" and produce profound repercussions for practitioners, who feel not only insecure but deeply puzzled as to why their activities are not producing expected results.

No theory provides a perfect fit with the facts, but when practitioners begin to understand that the most pressing problems they face have no solution within the old paradigm, halting questioning of that paradigm begins. The few practitioners who dared to question are eventually joined by others who begin working outside the bounds of "normal science" in an attempt to resolve the crisis. Normal science even gives way to

"extraordinary" science, which is typified by an enthusiastic reexamination of a profession or discipline's boundaries, uncowed by the deep shadows of the old paradigm. Alternative suggestions begin to blossom. Kuhn emphasizes the resistance such new paradigm proposals are likely to encounter, noting that rigidity within a profession may stifle challenges from inside, and suggesting that younger people who have received training in some other field are more likely to be able to see forests and not just trees: "In each case a novel theory emerged only after a pronounced failure in the normal problem-solving activity."[30] Since the emergence of a new theory breaks with one tradition of scientific practice and introduces a new one conducted under different rules and within a different universe of discourse, it is likely to occur only when the first tradition is felt to have gone badly astray.[31] New proposals are generally ridiculed as unprofessional, immature works of young, ignorant folk, but the new paradigm(s) eventually capture(s) the more flexible and thoughtful minds of the younger generation, and changes do come.

What does all this have to do with public relations? As historian David Hollinger has put it, "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions excites the imagination of working historians chiefly because much of what it says about scientific communities seems to apply so strikingly to other kinds of communities."[32] One such community is public relations, which is unquestionably a set of activities defined and controlled by tradition. The tyro entering a large public relations department or agency quickly learns that certain standard procedures are to

be followed and that other things "just aren't done." While every public relations problem provides somewhat different challenges, the operative tradition which Kuhn calls "paradigm" provides practitioners with criteria to distinguish one type of problem from another and set priorities for activity. The contingent nature of public relations experience-- the great variety of situations that arise-- is thus made into something which can be organized and subject to defined procedures of management and control.

Just as Kuhn's notion of "paradigm" has been celebrated by some and maligned by others, so the notion of public relations working under paradigm might at least raise some eyebrows. After all, most public relations practitioners come into the trade from other areas, such as journalism, general management, or occasionally law, and are not academically indoctrinated into public relations practices. Nevertheless, questions about working definitions and particular practices of the trade, addressed to individuals with several years or more of major corporate public relations experience, almost invariably produce answers that are not only within ballpark range of each other, but have the foul lines chalked in approximately the same places. The mainstream textbooks reflect, and sometimes give added shape, to that tradition. For instance, Cutlip and Center state in their textbook that, "Presenting all sides of an issue and providing an objective, balanced appraisal of the merits of conflicting views is a responsibility of the news media, not the practitioners."[33] (their emphasis). That is a credo in major

public relations departments, although the expression there is more colloquial: "It's not your business to care what's right." Similarly, textbook writer Raymond Simon tells practitioners and aspirants that "your primary obligation is to the organization for which you work."[34] That is a sentiment embraced by almost all current practitioners questioned, but one that would have been disputed widely in the nineteenth century and is disputed now by those who have higher (or lower) allegiances.

This is not to say that there are no discussions of philosophy within the current citadels of public relations practice. A Public Relations Society of America task force which in 1981 attempted to provide a succinct definition of the trade settled for not one sentence but two: "Public relations helps an organization and its publics adapt mutually to each other [sic]," and "Public relations is an organization's efforts to win the cooperation of groups of people."[35] Those two definitions reflect a debate within the trade on whether "two way" communication (the former definition) or "one way" communication, from the organization outward (the latter definition) should predominate. But, in practice, both camps emphasize subjective feelings of adaptation and communication rather than objective concepts of moral responsibility. Even honest communication is not worth much if the activities on which it is based are dishonest.

What current <u>public</u> discussion there is goes on strictly within the boundaries of the current paradigm of manipulation. There is an awareness of anomalies, but they are not subjects for polite conversation. Those few individuals who try to bring up

questions of objective truth at the beginning of public relations strategy sessions hear objections that such considerations may be interesting but are outside the tradition-- and the sessions inevitably lurch into the planning of manipulation. The definition of mainstream practice in the clutch almost invariably should be, "Public relations is the use of mass psychology and communications techniques in the attempt to create public attitudes and opinions beneficial to a client; also known as propaganda of word and deed." The advocacy of both one-way and two-way styles of communication are subsets of that desire to use mass psychology to gain organizational goals.

It was not always that way. At one time the emphasis was not on forcing public cooperation, or even winning public cooperation through two-way communication, but on producing a good product which would gain public acceptance. Corporate conservatives among public relations practitioners now stress changing the public. Corporate liberals among public relations practitioners stress changing the organization. But if neither considers the ethical obligations on both sides, the choice is really that of tweedledee versus tweedledum. The basic debate about public relations purpose aborted some twenty years ago because public relations practitioners had developed a comfortable paradigm which at that point was unshaken by the anomalies of social suspicion and mistrust of major institutions which have become apparent since the mid-1960's. A new debate about public relations purpose is long overdue, and we may soon see a movement within public relations thought from "normal

science" to "extraordinary science." Studying public relations history through the lenses of Kuhn's paradigm-based approach illuminates the possibilities for the trade's future.

Footnotes

1. Public Relations Quarterly, Fall, 1973, pp. 12, 24.

2. J. Carroll Bateman, "A New Moral Dimension for Communication," Public Relations Journal, August, 1958, p. 17.

3. Peter M. Sandman, David M. Rubin, David B. Sachsman, Media: An Introductory Analysis of American Mass Communications (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. 367. Quoted in Carolyn Cline, "The Image of Public Relations in Mass Comm Texts," Public Relations Review, Fall, 1982, p. 63.

4. Martin Mayer, Madison Avenue, U.S.A. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), p. 123.

5. Kenneth Henry, Defenders and Shapers of the Corporate Image (New Haven: College and University Press, 1972), pp. 89-90.

6. A 1981 survey showed 51 percent of the American adults polled saying they had a "clear idea" or a "general idea" of the kind of work that people in public relations do. Figures for other fields within the "communications industry" were 66 percent for "people in the press (TV and newspapers), 59 percent for "people in advertising," 46 percent for "people in magazine publishing" and 42 percent for "people in book publishing." The field that finished second in professed public understanding, advertising, rated last in esteem; the field that was understood least, book publishing, is generally considered to be highest in esteem of the five fields. (Fraser Seitel, The Practice of Public Relations, second edition, Columbus, Ohio, Chas. Merrill, 1984, p. 91)

7. Craig E. Aronoff and Otis W. Baskin, Public Relations: The Profession and the Practice (St. Paul: West Publishing Co.,1983); Scott Cutlip and Allen Center, Effective Public Relations, fifth edition (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prenctice-Hall, 1978); James E. Grunig and Todd Hunt, Managing Public Relations (Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York, 1984); Ronald P. Lovell, Inside Public Relations (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982); John E. Marston, Modern Public Relations (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979); Doug Newsom and Alan Scott, This is PR: The Realities of Public Relations (Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth, 1981); Lawrence W. Nolte, Fundamentals of Public Relations (New York: Pergamon, 1974); Robert T. Reilly, Public Relations in Action (Englewood Cliffs,

N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981); Seitel; Raymond Simon, Publicity and Public Relations Worktext, fifth edition, (Columbus, Ohio: Grid Publishing, 1983).

8. Cutlip and Center, p. 15.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., p. 576. The frequently-used Cutlip and Center textbook is particularly disappointing in that both authors had written articles quoting practitioners concerning the deeper problems of public relations, but then downplayed those problems in their textbook. For instance, Cutlip wrote a Public Relations Journal article in January, 1963, entitled "A Re-Examination of Public Relations' Platitudes," in which he quoted John H. Smith, Jr., a New York public relations counselor, saying, "We are foolish if we think that the untrue and the unjustified are not eventually stripped bare, tearing down public confidence in the very mechanism without which our own voices are futile." Cutlip also quoted public relations manager Patrick Sullivan noting that, "Many of us in the business have not come to grips with the question of whether we are doing right or wrong, and many persistently refuse to face the question....It must be unsettling to live with an unanswered question like this." (pp. 15-16).

11. Ibid. While newspapermen and cartoonists no longer have Richard Nixon to kick around and caricature, he is still popular among the textbook writers. One of the better textbooks, Doug Newsom and Alan Scott's This is PR/ The Realities of Public Relations, also lays into the convenient Nixon for saying about Watergate, "I felt sure that it was just a public relations problem that only needed a public relations solution." Newsom and Scott complain that "Nixon was equating 'cover-up' with public relations," but it's hard to resist thinking that this may have been the former president's only correct calculation in the whole sorry affair for, as Newsom and Scott acknowledge, "PR has long been associated with image making and the false front." (pp. 2,3)

12. Seitel, p. 4.

13. Nolte, p. 9.

14. J.A.R. Pimlott, Public Relations and American Democracy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951), p. 202.

15. Pimlott, p. 203. In public relations, blaming the outsiders has become so traditional that even insiders could not resist satirizing the tendency at times. An article in 1974 recommended ways to "blame others. Find a scapegoat. Run an 'us and them' ad-- the 'us' being PRSA's pure of heart, the 'them' being the heathens who don't belong." (Dan Forrestal, PRJ May, 1974, "Placing Public Relations in Perspective")

16. J. Carroll Bateman, "The Path to Professionalism," Public

Relations Journal, March, 1957, p.8.

17. Bateman, "A New Moral Dimension for Communication," Public Relations Journal, August, 1958, p. 17.

18. Ibid..

19. W. Howard Chase, "Nothing Just Happens, Somebody Makes It Happen," Public Relations Journal, November, 1962, p. 5.

20. Ibid. Chase went on to write, "It's reminiscent of an old German proverb that says, 'When the fox preaches, look to the geese.' Or, carrying it a little bit farther, it's the very heart of the doctrine of Machiaveili that the end justifies any means-- a conviction others hold about us that will haunt public relations until we dispel it. Machiavelli describes it this way: 'It is of great consequence to disguise your inclination and to play the hypocrite well; and men are so simple in their temper and so submissive to their present necessity that he that is neat and clean in his collusions shall never want people to practice them upon.'"

21. John L. Normoyle, "Let's Stop Kidding Ourselves," Public Relations Journal, June, 1958, p. 23.

22. Curiously, Normoyle criticized the critics of public relations but in his article acknowledged the validity of large parts of the criticism. For instance, he wrote that, "Publicity, as practiced in some quarters today, could stand a good fumigating. The amount of impossible material released under the guise of news each day is monumental: reams and reams of puff sheets with company or trade names in caps in each paragraph and not a shred of legitimate news in a carload; piles of photos and stories designed solely to inflate the ego of the executives who okayed them; junk which was written, reproduced and distributed in quantity merely to allow an agency to show a production record supposedly justifying substantial fees, and material which might be news if it were presented in other than a slovenly and amateurish fashion."

23. Dennis Altman, "How to Get Off the Back of the Bus," Public Relations Journal, February, 1963, p. 7.

24. Andrew Lazarus, "Who Says Public Relations is Intangible?" Public Relations Journal, September, 1963, p. 6. One aftershock of this period should be noted: In August, 1965, the journal ran, "A Counselor's Letter to His Son...and His Reply," by W. Howard and Thomas Chase. The father, W. Howard, complained about "irresponsible attempts to manipulate public opinion by means of mass communications media for short term advantage" and praised "the more difficult, but far more rewarding work of coordinating public and private interest by means of mutual understanding." Son Thomas, just beginning his career, responded with an apt question about such "coordinating" of public and private interest: "Does public relations have the power to promote real

understanding, or does it merely make people *think* they understand?" (pp. 11-12)

25. Arthur Cuervo, "The poor image of the image makers," *Public Relations Journal*, July, 1975, pp. 11-12.

26. Grunig and Hunt, pp. 21-25.

27. Ibid., p. 65.

28. Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. x.

29. Ibid., pp. 81-82.

30. Ibid., pp. 74-75.

31. Ibid., p. 85.

32. David Hollinger, "T.S. Kuhn's Theory of Science and its Implications for History," in Gary Gutting, ed., *Paradigms and Revolutions: Appraisals and Applications of Thomas Kuhn's Philosophy of Science* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame Press, 1980), p. 196.

33. Cutlip and Center, pp. 579.

34. Raymond Simon, *Publicity and Public Relations Worktext*, fifth edition (Columbus, Ohio: Grid Publishing, 1983), p. 271.

35. *Public Relations Journal*, June, 1981, p. 16.